EXHIBIT 3 continued

7	٠	
1	١.	
۰	_	

2

rehired at Lawrence; isn't that right?

3

A. Yes.

4 5

Q. Had she been terminated for any reason, she would not have been eligible to be rehired; is that right?

6 7

A. That is not necessarily correct, no.

8

Q. Why isn't that necessarily correct?

9

A. Well, there could be a situation

10

where someone is hired into a particular position

11

and perhaps during the probationary period

12

resigns, or is told that it is not a good fit by

13

the organization and leaves, and then sometime later, comes back and applies for a job, as I

14 15

said, having gotten different credentials, a

16

different job, a different situation. It's

possible the person could be rehired.

17

Q. Has that happened in Lawrence?

18 19

A. I can't say for certain if it has

20

happened or not happened. I'm speaking more toward the philosophy of what the rehire practice

21 22

would be.

23

Q. Going back to your communication

24

with Ms. Magone after the first time following

this first meeting on September 28th, with

A. I asked her to provide me with the specific dates for the attendance, the unplanned absences. And she did.

I asked her to tell me about the performance concerns. And she did.

I asked some clarifying questions during our discussion of the performance concerns.

I stated to Cathy that, as Ms.

Newmark was in her probationary period, as per
our policy, either Ms. Newmark or Lawrence

Hospital Center could decide to separate

employment.

I asked Cathy, what would be a convenient time to schedule Ms. Newmark's separation discussion. I asked her about Ms. Newmark's work schedule for that day, as we thought it would be best to, if possible, schedule the separation discussion toward the end of her shift.

I asked Ms. Magone if she had had any response from Ms. Newmark, to Ms. Magone's e-mail to Ms. Newmark, which, again, addressed Ms. Magone's intent and use of the word "young."

-1	

Pat Orsaia

2 reconcile the point?

- A. The fact that she was being separated from employment, had nothing to do with the alleged comment, using the word "young."
- Q. And that is based on what Cathy

 Magone told you; isn't that right that it had

 nothing to do with that?
- A. It's based on the documentation in the specific detail that the manager gave me regarding her reasons for separating employment.
 - Q. Who is the manager again?
 - A. Cathy Magone.
- Q. And who did Ms. Newmark complain about?
- A. She complained about an alleged comment from Cathy Magone.
- Q. So, you're saying, with respect to Magone, these are not allegations; but with respect to Ms. Newmark's alleged comment --
 - A. I'm not sure what you mean.
- Q. When you characterize what
 Ms. Magone tells you, it's a statement of fact.
 When you characterize what Ms. Newmark related to
 you what Ms. Magone told her, you use the word

4	
_	

7		
~		

"alleged."

Į.

Ö

- -

Why is there a difference?

- A. The information that was provided to me by Cathy Magone as to the rationale behind Ms. Newmark not successfully completing her probation, was documented information. That is why I asked Ms. Magone for the dates of unplanned absence, which she took right off her time sheets and showed me, and the information about the complaint about Ms. Newmark's performance, the lack of progress on the project, et cetera.
- Q. What was documented? What did you see that was documented?
- A. Ms. Magone had notes of the complaints from the other case managers that she shared with me.
 - Q. She had notes?
 - A. Yes
- Q. Did you see any documents or complaints from those case managers?
- A. Yes. I believe there were one or two, at least, that were actually maybe e-mails to Cathy Magone, expressing concern over Ms. Newmark's lack of responsiveness.

1		
_	_	

2

3

Ms. Magone. She went through it, although

5

had not successfully completed her probation and

6

that we were separating employment.

7

8 9

the document or, you know, reading through it, or

10

taking the time to do that.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

briefly, with Ms. Newmark. Cathy advised Ms. Newmark that she

And to the best of my recall at that point, Carole was not interested in going through

It was my sense that Carole wanted the meeting to end as quickly as possible after she knew that it was a separation discussion.

- Q. What, if anything, did Ms. Newmark say?
- Α. I don't recall her saying very much. I recall that she understood where the conversation was going. I believe she said, "I understand I'm being separated from employment."

I offered her at that point the option of submitting a letter of resignation. And I told Ms. Newmark that we were going to separate employment, but she did have a choice about whether it would officially be on the record as a termination of employment or

Pat Orsaia

resignation.

I pointed out to her that, should she decide to resign, that Lawrence Hospital Center would not stand in the way of any claim for unemployment insurance that she might put forth and that would otherwise be determined by the Department of Labor as being a legitimate claim.

And I told her that in terms of any prospective employment, that, as was our practice, we'll only share dates of employment and job title.

And I offered her the opportunity to decide whether she wanted it to be a resignation as opposed to a termination. I offered her the opportunity to make that determination -- take overnight to make that determination.

And we agreed that she would contact me the next day with her decision.

- Q. Was there anything else discussed at the meeting, apart from what you have already testified to?
- A. Yes. I advised Ms. Newmark that, when our meeting concluded, that Cathy would

time, that Ms. Magone told her Nicole was younger

	132
1	Pat Orsaia
2	A. What Ms. Newmark says in this
3	document
4	Q. I'm asking
5	A that Cathy denied that she said
6	that, quote, "Nicole was younger and could handle
7	the job better than I could."
8	Q. Did she ever advise you, yes or no,
9	that Ms. Magone told her that Nicole was young
10	and could handle was younger and could handle
11	— the job better than she could?
12	A. No.
13	Q. She never did. Okay.
14	Did Ms. Magone ever, at the
15	September 29th, meeting, ever state, in words or
16	substance, Nicole was young and could take things
17	in like a sponge?
18	MR. KEIL: I object as to
19	form.
20	Answer if you can.
21	A. I do not recall that as a direct
22	quote from Cathy Magone.
23	Q. You see how there is a quote that
24	Ms. Newmark wrote? She stated that she did say
25	that Nicole was quote, "young and could take

$\overline{}$	
ŀ	
1	
-	

her e-mail"? What e-mail is she referring to?

3 4

I think Cathy is referring to the e-mail she sent Carole, which again attempted to

5

clarify, in writing, what went into Cathy's

6

decision to assign Nicole to the palliative-care

7

program.

8

10

9

Ms. Newmark?

Α.

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And you asked her for a -- to find Q. out when, if she received any response from

A. I asked Cathy if her e-mail had prompted any further dialogue with Carole.

- October 5th, the date in which 0. Ms. Magone e-mailed you, is the date in which Ms. Newmark was terminated; isn't that right?
 - Α. Yes.
- To your knowledge, did anything occur from September 29th, 2006, until october 5th, 2006, concerning Ms. Newmark's performance anything new; additional absences, new incidents?
- I do recall Cathy told me that she Α. became aware during that time period, through some other source, that there had been some communication to Ms. Newmark from the registered nurse assigned to the palliative-care project,

1 :
-

Pat Orsaia

and that Cathy was concerned that Carole had not brought Cathy into the loop about that.

- Q. I'm sorry. I'm not -- what are you referring to? What communication?
- A. I don't know exactly what the nature of the communication was. Cathy told me that she had already stated to me and to Carole that Cathy was concerned that Carole had not made any progress to date on the project that she had been assigned to, the mental-health project. I'll call it that for lack --
- Q. You knew that already; you had known that already?
 - A. Yes, I knew that already.
- Q. What are you referring to about the palliative care?
- A. I'm not referring to palliative care.
- Q. I'm sorry; I misheard you, then.
 What palliative-care project are you referring
 to?
- A. I need to clarify that. I misspoke.

 I meant the mental-health project.
 - Q. You knew about that previous to

4-1

Pat Orsaia

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

that; right - about the issue with the mentalhealth project you testified to?

- I knew that Cathy had performance concerns in terms of Carole not making any progress on the mental-health program.
 - Q. Riaht.
- In response to your question what, if anything, new from a performance perspective was brought to my attention during that time period - what I'm saying is that during that time period, Cathy told me that she was even more. "concerned about Carole's lack of progress in regards to the mental-health project, because she had become aware that, in fact, Carole didn't share with her that the nurse, who was supposed to be working with Carole on this and had attended the training with her on the mentalhealth project, had communicated with carole about the project. And Carole failed to tell Cathy that there had been this communication.
- Q. So, there had been some progress. or --
- No; not only had there been no Α. progress, Carole, knowing that Cathy was keenly

149 1 Pat Orsaia 2 interested in seeing progress and had prompted. 3 Carole about it. Carole received some communication from the RN she was supposed to be 4 working with on the project and did not go to 5 Cathy to give her an update, and Cathy was 6 7 concerned about that. 8 So, the fact that she didn't relay a 9 communication she had with a nurse, she was 10 concerned about? 11 Ά. Yes, yes. Cathy was concerned that 12 Carole did not relay to Cathy that there had been 13 some communication or some update regarding the 14 project. I don't know the specifics of it. 15 Q. Do you know when Carole Newmark 16 communicated with that nurse? 17 Α. I don't. 18 Q. Do you know what the nurse's name 19 is? 20 A. No. 21 Q. Do you know where she works or where

- she is assigned to?
 - A. No, I don't.

22

23

24

25

So, in fact, there had been Q. communications concerning the mental-health

1	
Ψ.	

5

£- 6...

department with Ms. Newmark and the nurse, and I just want to clarify something: You're saying that Ms. Magone had an issue because Ms. Newmark had been communicating with the nurse and hadn't relayed that communication to her?

- A. Not exactly. I'm saying that
 Ms. Magone relayed to me that she was concerned
 because it came to her attention that the nurse
 had initiated communication with Carole Newmark
 about the project, and Carole had not updated her
 director about that.
- Q. About the fact that the nurse called her about the project?
- A. I don't know if it was a call, an e-mail, written correspondence. I don't know what the nature of the communication was or what the specifics of it were.
 - Q. And that was her concern?
 - A. That was her concern.
- Q. Anything else? Was there anything else from September 28th, until October 5th -- withdrawn.

When did Ms. Magone decide to terminate Ms. Newmark's employment?

	4	Pat	Orsaia
- 1	I:		

5

- A. About the deposition?
- Q. About the deposition.
- A. No.
- Q. Have you been in contact with any former employees of Lawrence Hospital since you left, apart from the two communications you have had with Ms. Magone?
- A. Yes; I have communicated with some of my former colleagues at Lawrence Hospital Center.
 - Q. With whom?
- department; with the former vice-president of human resources who left Lawrence, before I did; I have communicated with her. I spoke with the nurse manager at the ER at the time when I had a friend who was a patient at Lawrence. I spoke with another former member of the human resources department who left Lawrence before I did. I spoke with people at the switchboard.

That's all I can recall.

Q. Do you know whether -- how long the probationary period for Ms. Newmark's employment is?

		153
1		Pat Orsaía
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	or was?
4	Ä.	Yes.
5	Q.	How long?
6	Α.	Six months.
7	Q.	Do you know when her date of hire
8	was?	
9	Α.	I don't know the precise date, no.
10	Q.	Do you know whether she was hired on
11	or about Mar	ch 20th, 2006?
12	A .	That sounds correct.
13	Q.	And she was fired after that six-
14	month probat	ionary period?
15	Α.	Her probationary period had been
16	extended.	
17	Q.	By whom?
18	Α.	By her department director, as per
19	policy.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
20	Q.	Was it required that she when you
21	say "per pol	icy," what policy are you referring
22	to?	
23	Α.	The policy is called Probationary
24	Periods. It	's a human resources policy.
25	Q.	What does it say, in words or
	!	

Pat Orsaia

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

substance, the policy?

- Α. It says that the probationary period for exempt-level employees is six months. It says the probationary period for non-exempt employees is three months. It says that at the department manager's discretion, probation can be extended for a period of up to three months. It says that the probationary period is meant to introduce the individual to the organization, and vice versa. And that at any time during the probation, either party can determine that they do not want to continue the employment relationship.
- Q. Does that require approval from anyone to extend the probationary period?
- Α. I think it says -- the policy says it's with discussion with human resources.
 - 0. Discussion or approval?
- I don't know. You have the policy Α. in front of you. Maybe you can tell me what it says - discussion or approval.
- To your knowledge, as the director 0. of HR, are there any requirements that the head of a department needs the approval of the HR department?

Pat Orsaia

previously marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 21, for
identification.

I would like to direct your attention to Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, N425, directing your attention to 4.3, Paragraph 4.3: "During the last week of the probationary period, the supervisor will conduct a performance-review discussion with the employee."

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know whether Ms. Magone, the last week before the probationary period, the original probationary period for Ms. Newmark ended, had that meeting with her?
- A. Well, the probationary period being extended, I don't know that she did or didn't, but I don't believe that is the scenario that is discussed --
 - Q. I'm asking you --
 - A. -- in the policy.
 - Q. I'm asking you a question: Do you know whether Ms. Magone met with Ms. Newmark a week prior to the original probationary period ending, to discuss her performance?

	٠		
1	ŀ		
•			

Pat Orsaía

- 3

- A. I don't know that.
- Q. I'm going to direct your attention to 4.5, of the same page. It says, "The supervisor may recommend termination of employment at any time during the probationary period. This recommendation must be submitted in writing to human resources and the department head."

Did Ms. Magone ever submit her recommendation prior to the termination in writing?

- A. No, but she is the department head.
- Q. I understand, but this says this recommendation must be submitted in writing to human resources. I'm asking --
- A. This is referencing what the supervisor of the department is supposed to do at the supervisory level.
- Q. I'm asking you: Did Ms. Magone submit a request, a recommendation for termination to you prior to Ms. Newmark's termination?
 - A. Not in writing, no.
 - Q. Apart from Ms. Magone, did you